PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
PRINCETON, N. J.

PRESIDENT'S ROOM

December 13, 1915.

My dear Mr. Robinson:-

There will be a meeting of the Rhodes Scholarship Committee for the State of New Jersey on Wednesday, December 22nd, at three o'clock, at the office of President W. H. S. Demarest, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J. Candidates should appear in person with letters of introduction and other credentials.

Sincerely yours,

John Grier Hibben

To-
Mr. Stuart Robinson,
Princeton, N. J.

REV. PAUL MARTIN
REGISTRAR AND SECRETARY
OF THE FACULTY

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

12-5-
429-5

April 17, 1919.

Rev. Stewart Robinson,
3504 Baring Street,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Mr. Robinson:-

I wonder if you could let me know promptly whether or not anything is coming or likely to come your way in connection with the Bible teaching pastorate at Lafayette. If you are still in negotiation in regard to it I want to choke off a consideration of another man. Or to put it more accurately, he wishes not to be in it if you are still in it. If you are entirely out of it some action might be taken in his interest. Please be perfectly frank in regard to the matter because everyone concerned here would much rather have it go through in your favor if you want it.

You may be interested in this item. Dr. Warfield has heard this week from Professor Patterson of Edinburgh that the Free Church Theological College, and the Established Church Theological College at Edinburgh, and the University of Edinburgh have combined to form a graduate school of theology in which instruction will be offered by professors from all three institutions and which will give a degree of Th.D. in recognition of two years work. Dr. Warfield's corredpondence with France seems to make it clear, as you reported, that there is nothing over there for our Fellows and as it will evidently be a long while before Germany will be open to us for anything worth while, this looks like a solution of a difficulty which promises rather good results, especially as a man can begin work in Edinburgh in the English language as soon as he arrives.

Please give my greetings to your father, and to your wife. I am still persuaded that you are a very lucky man to have discovered her and captured her. You need not tell her this unless you think it is wise.

May I hear from you about the Lafayette matter as soon as your convenience allows.

Very sincerely yours,

Paul Martin

My dear Mr Robinson,

Freshman Crew Dinner

miss you very much. If you can spare the time would you kindly coach us some afternoon. On Thursdays & Fridays we go out at 4.45 and other days at 3.

Thanking you,

Sincerely

Paul N. Arth.

The Princeton Theological Review
Princeton, N. J.

7-24-23

July 5, 1923

Rev. Stewart M. Robinson,
First Presbyterian Church,
Lockport, New York.

My dear Mr. Robinson:

Your review of Lane's Evolution and Christian Faith reached me a few days ago. Please accept my thanks for your kindness in offering it for publication in the Review. I have seen the book but have not read it and consequently your review gave me an opportunity of learning something of the author's viewpoint.

I am sorry that I did not know of your plan to send me a review of this book sometime ago. Had I known it I might have saved you the trouble of preparing it, by telling you that the book had been assigned to Professor William Hallock Johnson. I received his review of it on Tuesday, a few days after yours reached me.

I have not read Professor Lane's book, although I have dipped into it a little, and one of the quotations which you make, to wit: "Evolution is God's method of operation in the realm of nature: Christianity is God's plan of operation in the spiritual world. The natural man, the product of the law of evolution, becomes transformed through the gospel of Christ into spiritual accord with the Father, becomes a spiritual child of God by adoption and thus attains to the hope of personal immortality" (pp. 198-199), has made me wonder whether Professor Lane has really faced what many opponents of evolution consider one of the most serious obstacles in the way of its acceptance, the Bible doctrine of the fall. The statement which you quote would seem to indicate that the gospel merely gives man what we might call superadded grace. Evolution has brought him by natural process to a certain point, or stage, of development and the gospel adds a spiritual factor, raises man to a still higher plane and gives him the assurance of immortality. But it is difficult to see how this can be regarded as meeting the conditions set forth in the Bible, both Old Testament and New. I should be glad to know what your judgment is in the matter.

Regretting that I have to return your review to you, and with best of good wishes for your summer vacation, I am

Sincerely yours,

Oswald T. Allis

A-R

REV. PAUL MARTIN
REGISTRAR AND SECRETARY
OF THE FACULTY

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

January 17, 1930.

The Rev. Stewart M. Robinson, D.D.,
Second Presbyterian Church,
Elizabeth, New Jersey.

Dear Dr. Robinson:-

Thank you for your letter of January 16th. I am glad that my letter fitted into the needs of the situation.

This is a crisis time with Mr. Brink and I think now that his affairs are out in the open and his friends can advise him frankly and will keep in touch with him, he may come through. Frankly, I think he is a man who has gotten the habit of bluffing himself and has fallen into the habit of trying to bluff other people. The former, of course, is the more serious matter and somehow he ought to learn not to deceive himself into thinking that he doing something that he is not doing. There may be something in the idea that Mr. Fendrich's irregular career in education seemed to him to be a precedent for him.

If we can do anything further in the matter of Mr. Brink, we will be glad to do it.

One thing more, he questioned between going into business for a time and going up to Hawley. Dr. Stevenson and I urged him not to go into business, but to take this opportunity at Hawley to be a testing time in regard to the ministry. If he goes into the brokerage business, he is likely to drop out not only from the ministry, but possibly out of active Christian work altogether. Perhaps that is the best thing for him to do, but it seems to me it would be better for him to go to Hawley and then in the Autumn to have his case candidly reviewed by everybody concerned, so that his decision might be one that we could support in Seminary and Presbytery.

Very sincerely yours,

Paul Martin

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

November 18th, 1937

The Rev. Stewart M. Robinson
23 Kempshall Place
Elizabeth, New Jersey

My dear Robinson:

I am enclosing, in accordance with your request, a transcript of the pledge taken by Princeton professors. I enclose at the same time some extracts from Dr. Charles Hodge on his understanding of subscription to the Westminster Confession. I have read one or two articles of Dr. Warfield's on the same subject, and both are equally clear that subscription to the Confession means subscription to the system of doctrine contained therein and not to every proposition in the historic document. This I feel to be of the very greatest importance. The real issue then becomes what belongs as an integral and irreducible part of that system of doctrine known as Reformed without which the system would lose its identity.

I shall keep in touch with you on the Homrighausen matter. I have asked him to let me have a positive statement regarding his attitude to the Bible. Those negative statements of his which were strung together in Dr. Craig's article do not, I know, do him justice. Taken by themselves they are most perplexing. What I feel is that he has allowed himself to sling around a lot of phrases as an emancipated Barthian because he wants to show that, despite his negations, he believes utterly and absolutely in the exclusive authority of the revelation of God contained in the Scriptures. Talking to Dr. Craig yesterday, he felt as I felt that his negative statements were quite unnecessary in the place where he made them and added really nothing to his argument.

I had yesterday a very interesting and profitable talk with Dr. Craig, who was free to admit that when it came to Homrighausen's and Brunner's thought regarding the "what" or the content of Holy Scripture he had no objection whatever. For him the problem is in the "how". He admitted, however, that to accept the "what" of Holy Scripture and to act upon it is more important than merely to accept a theory of the exact process whereby the Scriptures came to the birth.

Another matter which I discussed with Dr. Craig was what appeared to be the progressive movement of Brunner's mind from a merely negative attitude towards inspiration. Dr. Craig was interested to find, for example, that his "Philosophy of Religion", which has just been published in English, was published in German ten years ago. The books such as "The Mediator" and "Our Faith", which Brunner has published since then, are very different in their tone on certain matters. The same thing also appears to have happened to Karl Barth. It ought to be borne in mind, moreover, that a few years ago Brunner passed through a very deep religious experience which, as he himself confessed, gave him a totally different understanding of the Scriptures in a spiritual sense from what he had had before. All this reminds me that I never reviewed his "Philosophy of Religion", which you sent me once. If you desire it in the near future, I shall be very pleased to let you have a review of it.

The really important thing in the whole matter is that when it comes to a question of what God says in and through the Scriptures as the organ of His revelation, a man like Brunner shows himself to be one of the truest and most loyal heirs of the Reformed faith.

I should appreciate being kept in touch with your thought on the matter so that we can know each other's mind before anything is given to the general church public on the subject.

With warm personal regards,

Yours very cordially,

J A Mackay

JAM:VKT

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

November 29th, 1937
(Dict. November 27)

The Rev. Stewart M. Robinson, D.D.
23 Kempshal Place
Elizabeth, New Jersey

My dear Robinson:

I have had a reply from Dr. Homrighausen in answer to my letter asking for a positive statement regarding his attitude to the Bible. The enclosed has come to hand, which I hope you will feel, as I feel, is most satisfactory.

I have seen Dr. Craig about the whole matter, and he deprecates deeply that McIntire in THE CHRISTIAN BEACON should have called Homrighausen a liberal or a modernist, a term which is entirely unworthy and unjustifiable as applied to a man like him.

It would seem to me that whatever publicity is given to this statement should be given through CHRISTIANITY TODAY, where the matter began. For after all, the statement in question is a statement to the Board of Trustees, and the Board must decide what is to be done with it, and whether anything more should be done than have it ready for the General Assembly in case any question should be raised. I should appreciate, however, your view on this matter.

It grieves one deeply to see the malice that resides in the heart of a man like McIntire, and it shows one how easy it is for a man to believe in the Bible without sincerely believing in Jesus Christ, and without reproducing in his life the implications and sanctifying influences of the Christian faith.

With warm personal regards,

Yours ever,

J A Mackay

JAM:VKT
Enc.

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

December 20th, 1937
(Dict. December 18)

The Rev. Stewart M. Robinson, D.D.
23 Kempshal Place
Elizabeth, New Jersey

My dear Robinson:

I am sorry to be putting such a strain upon your patience with my long delay on the two items you asked me for, an outline of my address to the Foreign Board, and a review of Brunner's book. My nose has been so much at the grind-stone when here, and I have had so many important outside engagements to fill in on the side, that literary projects of all kinds have had to be laid aside for these last weeks. I am hoping, however, to get some things done during the vacation.

In accordance with my promise to keep you in touch with developments, I am sending you two confidential documents in the form of letters received by Dr. Speer and passed on to the Curriculum Committee of the Trustees. This Committee is making a unanimous recommendation to the Board to send a call to Brunner. A special meeting of the latter has been called for Tuesday to deal with the matter.

I want to say, also confidentially, that the Trustees are going to ask Brunner, in connection with the call, for a clarification of some phases of his position. I am wondering if the moment would not be opportune to publish the editorial that you had in mind. It ought not to be stated that Brunner has had a call, because I don't think this should be given to the general public until negotiations have been completed, for nobody knows whether he will accept or not, and it would be most embarrassing all around for publicity to be given to a call which he might turn down. So what would be in order would be a simple statement of the editorial viewpoint or desire.

Rolston is the author of that book, "A Conservative Looks at Barth and Brunner", and Stewart MacLennan of course you know.

I have had one or two good talks with Dr. Craig, who is perfectly clear that the "what" of revelation is more overwhelmingly important than the "how" of inspiration. He also is perfectly clear that Dr. Patton and Dr. Warfield held different views of inspiration. I have been very much impressed by the statement of Dr. Patton in "Fundamental Christianity", which makes the nature, scope, and degree of inspiration a matter for inductive study. You undoubtedly know the passage and have the book, but as I have several copies I am forwarding you one. It might be an admirable thing to give publicity to this one of these days.

What is growing upon me is the realization that there is no official Reformed doctrine of inspiration. The Westminster Confession does not commit itself to a theory, while the Heidelberg Catechism and the Thirty-nine

Articles do not deal with the matter at all. The tremendously important thing is that God has spoken in a supernatural and absolute way, and that we have access to what He has said. Then the great question becomes to hear Him and obey Him. And yet, on the question of inspiration, I cannot but feel that the Barthian viewpoint, especially in Brunner, has mellowed in the last few years. But more of this anon, when I write my article.

I cannot tell you how much your loyal cooperation means to me as I think in terms of the future of this institution and Christianity in the country. Our Seminary Bulletin will be out in a few days. I have written a little article which will appear at the beginning entitled "The Role of Princeton Seminary", in which I advocate the development of a graduate school of Reformed theology.

With warm personal regards and Christmas greetings to Mrs. Robinson and you and all the members of your family,

Yours very cordially,

J A Mackay

JAM:VKT
Enc. 3

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

December 31st, 1937

The Rev. Stewart M. Robinson, D.D.
23 Kempshall Place
Elizabeth, New Jersey

My dear Robinson:

I am asking Homrighausen to prepare the article that you desire. At next Faculty meeting I shall raise the question of a monthly article from one of our professors, and also for reviews of books, and shall be willing to constitute myself local editor to gather up material for you.

I greatly appreciate your loyal cooperation. As soon as I hear from Brunner I shall let you know. Within the next week I hope to let you have something myself.

With warm personal greetings and best wishes for the New Year to you and all your family,

Yours very cordially,

J A Mackay

JAM:VKT

Prof. Dr. Theol. EMIL BRUNNER

Zürich,
Klusdörfli 12 20. 1. 38.

To the board of trustees of the Princeton Theological Seminary, USA.

Gentlemen, brothers in Christ,

May I begin this letter with an expression of my heartfelt thanks for the personal warmth and almost incredible confidence in me, - who to most of you am personally unknown - which strikes me from the very first word in your letter of invitation to the chair of systematic theology in your seminary. I felt: it is friends who are calling here and it is truly under God's guidance that they have taken their decision. Thus, from the moment your letter was in my hands, I knew that "God was in this thing" and it was certain that I could not, for any reason however well grounded, answer in a negative way. The personal lines which Dr. Mackay, Dr. Speer, and Dr. Mudge, either by writing or by telegram, accompanied this weighty letter added much to this feeling of obligation and gratitude. It was a strange coincidence that your official letter - copied by Dr. Mackay - reached me together with his letter with the very last post delivery of the year 1937, at 6 o'clock p.m. on December 31st.

As you put the most important things in the first place let me do the same and tell you that I would feel perfectly free in my conscience to accept your call so far as my theological convictions are concerned. I do not only firmly believe in the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ according to the teaching of the apostles, especially according to Paul and John, and in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures according to the commentaries which Princeton Seminary has placed in my hands, but it is more than ever my earnest desire to devote the remaining life-time which God may grant me to the interpretation, defense and preaching of this scripture teaching being the only hope of our poor world. I know that certain questions were raised by you as to my attitude towards the historical facts and the trustworthiness of the Gospels. These questions were, if I understand rightly, based on certain remarks in my Philosophy of Religion. Now, unfortunately, the translator of this book did not mention the fact that this book was written in 1925, i.e., in the beginning of my theological "revolution", if I may call it so, and therefore shows many traces of a stage of an evolution which is characterised by a constant and steady concentration towards the sacred history and the teaching of the Bible. My only ambition is to become more and more a Bible theologian and to know nothing but Jesus Christ crucified. If there is a certain difference between Karl Barth and myself it is this, that I find in his theology certain tenets which are not in accordance with Scripture, e.g., his indifference towards the historical facts as such and the lack of fullness in his witness to the life-renewing power of the Holy Spirit. It is, however, my conviction that faith in the inspiration of the Bible does not exclude but include the distinction between the Word of God and the earthly, temporal vessel which carries it.

As to the reformed or presbyterian type of doctrine, I feel thoroughly at home just in this conception of the Gospel-truth and I believe to be more true to this tradition than my friend Barth whose merit, however, in bringing theology back to this line, I heartily acknowledge. There are certain elements of the traditional doctrine which I do not consider as an adequate expression of the New Testament teaching, but I hold that these are minor points, and I am ready to correct my views any time wherever I see that the authority of the Bible stands against them.

Now, to be quite frank, I confess that the great expectations which you seem to combine with my coming to Princeton frightened me. I do not lack a good deal of selfconfidence as a theologian or interpreter of the Gospel. But I also feel my weakness in many points. I am honestly afraid that you will be disappointed by the

contrast between your expectations and my real capacities and work. I know that God can work also thru very frail instruments, and Paul's phrase that His grace is mighty in the weakness of men is one of the really great experiences of my life, just as the great gospel of the justification of the sinner which is the only basis of my life, since many years. But you seem to expect as a result of my teaching at Princeton results which I do not feel any right to expect, especially if I consider the great handicaps under which I, as a foreigner and one who does not perfectly master your language would have to work.

On the other hand, the field of work to which you invite me is so unknown to me and my capability to overcome its difficulties so undertain that I have not the courage to answer your call with a full yes. Besides, the work which I have begun in my country, the obligations to my native city and country and the opportunities of the work here are so great and manifold that I felt unable to cut thru all these ties in such a way as the acceptance of your call would have made necessary. Therefore, I resolved to propose to you a preliminary solution of the question in this way, that I would come to you next fall for a trial year which leaves the final decision open for you as well as for me. It is true, you were generous and courageous enough to elect me beforehand. I am aware of the magnitude of your decision and most thankful for this confidence but I dare not accept it. I think you as well as I have a right to see before you bind yourself.

As soon as I had your official letter I communicated it to our minister of education and explained to him in a personal interview the situation. I did the same thing in our faculty and in both places I found the same appreciation of the great honor of your election and of the vast possibilities implied in it. Also did I find the same expectation that I would answer you in the negative. My proposal to come to you for a trial year was accepted as the lesser of two evils, and so I got my leave for one year. The expression of the hope of my return from the part of my colleagues and the minister of education was very warm and earnest; but I made it clear from the beginning that the final decision was put off.

I would not have dared to propose to you such a medium solution had not Dr. Mackay and Dr. Mudge in their conversation with me in Oxford themselves hinted at such a possibility for the case that I could not resolve beforehand to accept your call in an integral way. As soon as I had the consent of the minister I wrote Dr. Mackay and asked him to send me a cable at once in the case that you would not be willing to accept this halfway solution. From the fact that such a message did not reach me as yet I conclude that you are ready to consent to my proposition. After much prayer and sharing with friends and colleagues this seemed to me the only conscientious answer for this moment. I hope your disappointment is not too great and I also hope that you will understand my reasons for deciding so.

Now it would be necessary to settle questions of detail. As a year of leave means a year without any pay I calculated on the basis of your salary offer. It is true that I would have the extra expenditure of travelling both ways and that I would not have the profit of the free house, because I cannot use an empty house by myself. But I leave it to you how you would solve this financial problem. More important is the question what I am to do during this year so as to get the greatest possible effect out of it without overtaxing my forces. As I do not know enough of the details of your teaching situation I think it is best that Dr. Mackay makes a plan as soon as possible so that I can use the spring time holidays to begin my preparations. There is one awkward item which bothers me. A year ago I was asked to give 5 lectures at Glasgow University in the end of September. Now I should much prefer to postpone these lectures for next year to keep the trial year unparted. I hope Dr. Mackay would be able to help me in the solution of this particular problem of time.

Let me close this letter by telling you how eagerly and full of expectations I

look forward to this Princeton year. May God give his blessing. I feel it in my heart that it is His will that I should come to you under these conditions. I am sure he will show the way afterwards.

Yours most cordially,

(Signed) H. EMIL BRUNNER

THE COMPANY WILL APPRECIATE SUGGESTIONS FROM ITS PATRONS CONCERNING ITS SERVICE

1201-S

CLASS OF SERVICE

This is a full-rate Telegram or Cablegram unless its deferred character is indicated by a suitable symbol above or preceding the address.

WESTERN UNION

(18)

SYMBOLS

DL = Day Letter
NM = Night Message
NL = Night Letter
LC = Deferred Cable
NLT = Cable Night Letter
Ship Radiogram

R. B. WHITE
PRESIDENT

NEWCOMB CARLTON
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

J. C. WILLEVER
FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

The filing time shown in the date line on telegrams and day letters is STANDARD TIME at point of origin. Time of receipt is STANDARD TIME at point of destination.

Received at 1211 East Grand Street, Elizabeth, N. J.

1938 APR 1 PM 4 20

NAT269 46 DL=PRINCETON NJ 1 342P

DR STEWARD M ROBINSON=

23 KEMPSHAL PL EP=

DR ZWEMER HAS SHARED WITH ME PROOFS OF BARNHOUSES ARTICLE STOP IT WOULD BE EXCEEDINGLY UNWISE AND UNFAIR TO PUBLISH SUCH AN ARTICLE UNDER THE PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCES WITHOUT GIVING BRUNNER AN OPPORTUNITY TO PUBLISH HIS REPLY IN THE SAME NUMBER STOP LETTER FOLLOWING BY SPECIAL DELIVERY=

JOHN A MACKAY=

WESTERN UNION GIFT ORDERS SOLVE THE PERPLEXING QUESTION OF WHAT TO GIVE

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

April 1st, 1938

The Rev. Stewart M. Robinson, D.D.
23 Kempshal Place
Elizabeth, New Jersey

Dear Stewart:

Dr. Zwemer shared with me today at lunch the proofs of an article written by Dr. Barnhouse in the form of an indictment of certain ideas of Dr. Brunner's. I regret exceedingly that you did not mention to me anything about this article when you were here on Tuesday. I had promised to keep you in touch with any information that came to my notice on the subject of Brunner, and I understood that you would keep me in touch also with matters concerning him and the Seminary which it would be advisable for me to know of before their publication.

The decision to publish this article on April 7th is, to my mind, a very unhappy and unfair one, and one which is not in the best traditions of polemical writing established by John Calvin and maintained by the great polemists of the Reformed tradition. In the first place, Dr. Barnhouse quotes a statement of Karl Barth's regarding Emil Brunner without giving any indication as to what Barth is really objecting to in Brunner's position, or rather, what Brunner objected to in Barth's position. As a matter of fact, in this particular controversy it is acknowledged by Reformed thinkers that Brunner is much closer to the Reformed tradition than Barth. For Brunner maintains the reality of common grace and natural revelation, which Barth denies, and also the fact which used to be so strongly emphasized by Rabbi Duncan in Edinburgh, that the fall did not obliterate the image of God in man, as Barth virtually maintains it did. That being so, it is eminently unworthy that a great man like Barth should be quoted in a blanket statement regarding his friend Brunner without the concrete facts of the controversy between them being clearly stated, as well as Brunner's position.

In the second place, it is difficult for me to find words to express my sense of the injustice of directing questions to a man who is living on another continent. Weeks must inevitably elapse before a reply could possibly come. By that time irreparable harm could be done to a great Reformed theologian in the minds of many people whose judgment regarding him would be completely formed before ever he could get a pen to paper. In a matter of this kind, it seems to me the fair and recognized procedure is, where what is at stake is true and the integrity of Christian personalities is questioned, that in the same number in which an indictment appears in a representative and creditable journal like THE PRESBYTERIAN, the reply of the person indicted should appear simultaneously. It seems to me that at least some authorized person who knows the work of Barth and Brunner and who has a deep understanding of evangelical theology, should have the opportunity of publishing a statement to appear simultaneously with the statement of Dr. Barnhouse, until Dr. Brunner's own statement should be at hand.

In the third place, Dr. Barnhouse' article gives evidence of a total lack of understanding and appreciation of the real issues at stake. He does not recognize, for example, what Barth and Brunner have in common in their conception of the supra-historical and of the reality of the fall as a supra-historical fact. If there is one thing that Brunner emphasizes more than another, it is the reality of man's status as a sinner and his total dependence upon the grace of God in Christ for redemption.

Now I want to make it clear that I am not afraid of controversy regarding Brunner or Princeton Seminary, if the rules observed are such as common Christian sentiment would regard to be fair where personalities and institutions are concerned, and the possibility of immediate self-defense is guaranteed. Having the firmest faith in your sense of fairness, I believe that you will recognize the unwisdom and unfairness of publishing this article on April 7th.

It was a sincere pleasure to have had you with us and to hear you last Tuesday. Your words had a wholesome effect upon our boys, and I trust that in the years ahead there will be many opportunities to have you speak to them as a great exponent of Christian journalism at its best.

It was a very special pleasure to have had Mrs. Robinson along with you.

With warm regards,

Yours very cordially,

John A. Mackay

JAM:VKT

John A. Mackay

P.S. I ought to add that Dr. Zwemer feels exactly as I do on this matter, and informs me that he has pled with you not to publish this article right out of the blue without an accompanying rejoinder from Dr. Brunner.

J.A.M.

April 1,1938

Dear John:-

I am quite surprised to discover that Dr.Barnhouse can create so much dis-ease in Princeton. I don't recall that his article came into my mind while I was with you Tuesday. Anyway we had no time for talk, not being to-gether, except in company with many others.

Dr.Zwemer did not pleade with me not to run it. I mentioned that Barnhouse had sent an article asking some questions which seemed to me like real enough questions and were expressed in courteous and calm language. Dr.Zwemer said: "Are you going to let Barnhouse into the paper?" I replied, I thought so, inasmuch as his article was as described. That ended the subject.

Dr.Zwemer did go on to indicate that Brunner's coming is a matter of very acute disturbance in the faculty at Princeton. That was news. You have not spoken of it to me. Possibly had you done so, I might have had an eye out for possible danger in this paper by Barnhouse.

Happily the Lord over-rules. I acted at once and have definitely parked the article until we all get to-gether on where we stand. Your wire came in time. Now I know how delicate the situation is, I will drive cautiously.

Let me know all your mind. My prayer is for Princeton to get going again with her old swing on a sound platform and in the unity of the Spirit. We have to take account of adverse voices. The paper must be a forum for all fair and honest discussion. We will always follow the way that seems truest, wisest, and kindest, as God gives us to see it.

Don't be anxious about me, for I am firm in my affection for you, for Don Barnhouse and all my brethren. Somehow in God's great world of truth there must be a common ground for conservatives, and I pray I may help to establish that ground.

Yours affectionately,

President John A.Mackay.

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT

January 6, 1939

Dr. Stewart M. Robinson
The Presbyterian
1217 Market St.,
Philadelphia, Penna.

My dear Dr. Robinson

Thank you for your very gracious note.

I am glad to read my article and do appreciate your editorial. I sincerely hope that we can keep this question alive until the Church really gives its mind to its solution.

Sincerely yours,

Henry S. Brown

HSB:MU

Henry S. Brown

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

January 9, 1939

Dear Stewart:

I am rushing off a reply to you just before I leave to attend a meeting of Presbyterian Seminary Presidents at Louisville.

Dr. Brunner has come back from his visit among the brethren of the Southern Church. He says that he spoke twenty-five times to different groups. The only little unpleasant clash he had, he says, was in Decatur, Georgia, with Dr. Childs Robinson. It appears that the latter asked him point-blank what he thought of Dr. Warfield. He said that he preferred Hodge to Warfield, and indicated that he was unable to accept Dr. Warfield's particular doctrine of inspiration. I think you will admit that Dr. Warfield, in his particular doctrine of inspiration went beyond what our Confession of Faith for the Presbyterian Church teaches, for our Presbyterian standards have never officialized a doctrine of inspiration, although they imply a very high doctrine. It would be most unfortunate it seems to me to judge an institution and everyone else by the doctrine of a particular man, for after all, the Princeton tradition is one thing, and the Warfield tradition is quite another thing. On the other hand, I deprecate anybody, whoever he is, implying that I or any of my colleagues here are hostile to the great name of Dr. Warfield who was my own revered teacher.

Dr. Brunner showed me several letters he had about his articles in The Presbyterian, from both ministers and laymen, speaking of them in the very highest terms. I don't know what your correspondent means by "hot spots", but I do think that in the world of today the very hottest spots center in the deity of our Lord, His substitutionary atonement, justification by faith, the reality of an absolute revelation of God, themes with which Dr. Brunner has already dealt. For these themes are under violent attack at the present time and there is no comparison between them and other matters upon which Christians differ.

On the other hand, you have the absolute assurance that no one will become a professor who is not willing to sign without reservations the standards of our Church.

In regard to Dr. Brunner, let me say in very strict confidence that according to all evidence, it would

appear that his mind is to return to Switzerland at the end of the present year. The whole matter will be definitely dealt with within the next month or so.

Let us keep in touch as we have been doing and employ all frankness with each other.

With warmest personal regards,

Yours affectionately,

John A. Mackay

Dr. Stewart Robinson
23 Kempshall Place
Elizabeth, New Jersey

Dictated, but signed in
Dr. Mackay's absence

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

January 24, 1939

Dr. Stewart Robinson
23 Kempshall Place
Elizabeth, New Jersey

My dear Stewart:

I have not yet seen a copy of The Beacon, but will see whether they have a copy in our Library. I am wondering what the two presbyteries are that have protested Dr. Brunner's invitation to speak at Union Seminary, Richmond. I have written to a friend in the Southern Presbyterian ministry asking him to obtain information for me regarding this matter. I do know that our friend, Professor Childs Robinson of Atlanta has been most assiduously writing to different people in the Northern and Southern Church regarding Dr. Brunner.

I would suggest that if any correspondent write you inquiring any statment of Brunner or ideas alleged to have been spread by him it would be well to ask them to correspond directly with Dr. Brunner himself. I think that would be the most satisfactory solution. In regard to verbal inspiration, of course Brunner does not accept that particular theory of inspiration. Moreover, while believing in the infallible character of the Biblical revelation he does not believe in the inerrancy of the records in matters of detail where these matters of detail do not relate to the central revelation nor the central purpose of God in the Bible. On the other hand, for him the Bible is the absolute and the sole source of Christian theology. This is where he takes issue with all Modernists.

To my mind, it might be a good thing to get Dr. Brunner to write on his position in regard to the Bible. This, it seems to me, will be raised in a very natural way by an article which he has asked me to have typed out for him on the subject of the Incarnation and the Virgin Birth. I am forwarding to you this article, herewith. In it he states in the background of the Incarnation his view of the Virgin Birth in the Bible and in the scheme of Christian truths. Obviously the question that will be raised immediately is his view of the authority of Holy Scripture. As one who believes firmly and fervently in the Virgin Birth myself, I recognize the point he is trying to make that the what of Incarnation is one thing and the how quite another. On the other hand, it does raise the question of the Biblical records at a very important point, and on a

particularly crucial matter. It would seem to me that if you comment on this article in an editorial, it might be well to throw out the suggestion that Dr. Brunner write an article on his particular view of the Biblical record and scriptural authority that leads him to his particular attitude regarding the Virgin Birth. You will observe that he does not deny it categorically, but that on Biblical grounds he does raise the question regarding its actual historicity. If you raised this question in a natural and dispassionate way it would bring forth, I believe, another full statement from him on his Biblical position which would be very clarifying. I do hope, however, that it will be possible to handle this matter in a calm and dignified way. What we want is to give Dr. Brunner the best kind of opportunity to state his position. Appraisals will come later. I think you have been perfectly marvelous and Princeton Seminary is deeply your debtor for the way in which you have handled everything.

I wish to pass on to you in confidence, that Dr. Brunner has practically decided to return to Switzerland. That being so, it is particularly desirable that there should be no unworthy controversary, such as Dr. Craig indulges in over the matter. The whole question of his relation to the Seminary will be decided within the next few weeks. As soon as information is definite and a decision taken, I will let you know, so that you can give publicity to the notice. You understand my point. If our distinguished theological guest is to return to Switzerland to his home country it would be well to let him do so without any storm breaking out around him which would do no one any good, and in international circles our Church and even the country great harm in the eyes of conservative European evangelical who believe that Dr. Brunner is one of the outstanding leaders of the evangelical faith today. In a word, considering all that he does stand for, and his record as a fighter in the evangelical cause against liberalism, let us continue to follow our best traditions, and handle everything with order and dignity as has been done heretofore.

With affectionate regards,

Yours ever,

John

P. S. Since dictating this letter early in the morning your letter has arrived.

Sometime I will show you, if I get the writers consent, a very remarkable letter which Dr. Brunner

has written to Dr. Craig, in which he chides him in a most Christian way about giving a totally wrong impression to readers of Christianity Today regarding his position on the matters listed in a paragraph to which you refer in your letter. Let me add to what I have already written, that it is not fair to say that Dr. Brunner takes issue with the fundamental position of the Confession of Faith regarding the authority of the Holy Scriptures. Moreover, it is positively untrue that he is opposed to Infant Baptist or that he holds an un-Presbyterian or un-American conception of the state. These things Dr. Brunner categorically denies in the letter to which I refer. It is perfectly clear that the time has now come for Dr. Brunner to present his viewpoint on controversial matters freely and in his own way. And, as I have stated already, let us bear in mind that he is a man who is more loyal than any great theologian that I know today to the absolute deity of our Lord, his substitutionary atonement and bodily resurrection.

I trust that you will feel it to be appropriate to observe in drawing attention to such points as the above that in respect of the fundamental content of the Reformed Faith Brunner holds tenaciously and unswervingly to it.

With renewed regards,

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

February 6, 1939

Dr. Stewart Robinson
23 Kempshall Place
Elizabeth, New Jersey

My dear Stewart:

When I arrived home on Friday, I learned from my secretary that Dr. Brunner had asked her to send you a telegram asking you not to publish the article in question. After Faculty meeting on Saturday Dr. Brunner had a conference with me about the matter. His feeling was that in view of the focus in which you had set the matter in the editorial, it would not be in the interest of the Seminary that the article should appear. In that, of course, I share his viewpoint. But as the idea of the article had been his own, knowing that there was a certain amount of questioning in people's minds regarding his viewpoint on the subject of the Virgin Birth, I was quite willing to allow the article to be published. I thought it most preferable that people should get his viewpoint on the subject in the background of his strong affirmation of the incarnation rather than be led to believe that he was not a supernaturalist.

On the other hand, in view of the fact that Dr. Brunner has definitely decided to return to Switzerland, it seems to me better that the remaining months of his stay here should be free of all controversial matters and that he should be allowed to make the magnificant contribution which he is making along lines upon which all of us are agreed. His lecturing this semester deals with the great vitals of the Christian faith along the lines in which we are all most heartily at one.

At our annual Faculty dinner in our home last Friday evening, Dr. Loetscher, who was toastmaster, made the statement that in all his theological reading, even among the Greek and Latin fathers, he had found no more satisfying statement of the atonement than in Dr. Brunner's "The Mediator." That from Dr. Loetscher was a very great deal.

I trust, therefore, that in view of all the circumstances, this matter may drop. If we had our Princeton Theological review, it would be very much in order for a technical discussion of the whole problem, but in view of the

fact that the generality of our church people would find it impossible to get Brunner's viewpoint to the right focus, it would be very unwise to disturb the church atmosphere over the matter. I say this especially because I know that you who feel as strongly as I do on the Virgin Birth have the assurance that when it comes to the dogmatic content of Christianity in all that relates to the person and work of our Lord, Brunner is more satisfactory than very many conservative theologians. That is to say, nothing of a dogmatic ~~content~~ nature bearing upon the structure of Christianity derives from his particular idea of the Virgin Birth. And of course Dr. Warfield himself made it plain in his discussion of the subject that in Christianity no particular soteriological or even Christological doctrine is founded upon the Virgin Birth as distinct from the incarnation.

Let me again express my deep appreciation of your fine, fair attitude in this as in other matters.

We have got off to a fine start in the work of the second semester with everyone happy and united. For that reason I am most anxious that no disturbing element come into our whole situation.

I understand that Dr. Craig heard Dr. Homrighausen preach in the First Church of Princeton about a week ago, and was very greatly pleased with the sermon. Homrighausen is making a very deep impression everywhere he goes, and the students are very enthusiastic about him. He has certainly developed marvelously in the last year.

I trust this will find you all well in Elizabeth. Duncan and Stewart were together last night at the meeting in the University. I hope that between us all we may be able to find some first class evangelical pastor for our Westminster Foundation on the sister campus.

With affectionate regards,

Yours ever,

John

JAM:F John A. Mackay

P.S. Excuse erasures as my secretary is ill.

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

February 9, 1939

Dr. Stewart Robinson
23 Kempshall Place
Elizabeth, New Jersey

My dear Stewart:

Thank you ever so much for sharing with me Dr. Bowman's letter. It is to my mind admirable. You will find another article by Dr. Rolston in "The Presbyterian of the South." These together might form splendid copy for an article by you on Brunner. The attitude of Bowman and Rolston represents my own. I have maintained all along that we have got to be careful lest the issues that we raise are not the important issues in our time. The more one comes into contact with students, as Bowman says, the more one realizes the insidious influences that are going on in a whole host of our colleges undermining completely the faith of youth. Our Presbyterian Church is not unaffected by this situation.

As soon as there is something definite and official to relate regarding Dr. Brunner and the Seminary, I will let you know immediately, but no word should be said, of course, in The Presbyterian before the matter has come formally before the Administrative Committee of the Trustees, which meets on the third Monday in February. Then is the time when an article would be very much in order, in which the really big things about Brunner would be set forth, showing how he stands at the point where the battle is fiercest against everything that our evangelical faith stands for. It distresses me so much to see many people who have absolutely done nothing to fight the foes of evangelical Christianity in our time devote themselves exclusively to picking holes in the theology of a man who has borne the labor and heat of the day. God and the Presbyterian Church will know how to handle these people in the end. I wish to goodness some of our brethren would get down to really constructive work in the interests of the church and the Kingdom.

You will doubtless have heard regarding the letter of President Lacy and the faculty of Union Seminary, Richmond, defending their action in having Dr. Brunner speak during the Sprunt Lecture week. They said quite flatly that they were not running a hothouse establishment. They were eager for their students and others who come to the lectures to be brought into contact with really virile thought.

I have also seen a very remarkable editorial

which appeared in the Charlotte Observer, which the editor, an outstanding Presbyterian of a very conservative background attacked the presbyteries who had protested against Dr. Brunner being invited to Richmond.

I don't know if I told you that I have to give the Sprunt Lectures next year. I propose dealing with the theme, "Christian Foundations." There I shall have an opportunity of unfolding my thoughts on many fundamental matters. I have also to give the Croall Lectures in the University of Edinburgh in 1941, and there I shall have another opportunity to do something constructive, I hope. On March the eighteenth, I have to pay a rapid visit to Aberdeen, my old University, which has very graciously decided to confer upon me a Doctor of Divinity Degree. Action was taken a year ago, but I have not been able to go over, so I propose stealing away for about three weeks in order to be present at the graduation ceremony. I prefer to be away in March, rather than be absent at the time of our Ministers Summer Conference.

I have asked Dr. Brunner to continue the series, and have in mind very especially your suggestion regarding an article against American Pragmatism, etc. A line or two from you personally would be a good thing to stimulate him and keep him going.

We are having a really splendid time this semester. The spirit among the students and faculty could not be better.

With affectionate regards,

Yours ever,

John

JAM:F John A. Mackay

P.S. Thanks for the new editorial. I will let you have suggestions immediately after my meeting with the Trustees in time for the Presbyterians on March 2 Liberty.

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

March 10, 1939

Dr. Stewart Robinson
23 Kempshall Place
Elizabeth, New Jersey

My dear Stewart:

It was a pleasure to receive your letter, and still more to have seen you so recently in Pittsburgh. It will be perfectly in order now to make an announcement that Dr. Brunner has decided not to accept a permanent position in the Seminary. It seems to me that the editorial that you drafted formerly is very admirable, and could quite well be used. I don't think, on the other hand, that an article from me regarding Brunner is necessary or appropriate at this time. I will most certainly write one, however, at the end of the academic year when we shall be bidding him farewell, and when there will be something special in his honor. It would be in order also to mention that you understood that when Princeton University learned that Dr. Brunner intended to return to Switzerland, they extended to him an invitation to occupy the new Chair of Religion which is being founded in the University. You are free also to say in this matter, that Dr. Brunner will not give his final decision to the University until he has returned to Switzerland in June.

In regard to my own plans, they are as follows. I sail on the Brittanic on March the eighteenth for Liverpool, to attend the spring Graduation ceremony at the University of Aberdeen, to receive the degree of Doctor of Divinity which the University decided to confer upon me about a year ago. I shall be absent about three weeks. You may also mention if you care to, that the University of Edinburgh has invited me to give the Croall Lectures in 1941. I hate publicity, and prefer to go quietly on my way, but if you put this down in a simple way it will keep the folks of the church informed. I have to give the Sprunt Lectures in Richmond next February, so you can see how my time will not be going abegging for the next two or three years.

I will do my very best to see Professor MacLean when I am in Edinburgh, and shall be glad to carry to him whatever message you desire.

With affectionate regards,

Yours ever,

John

John A. Mackay

JAM:F

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

April 28, 1939

Dr. Stewart Robinson
23 Kempshall Place
Elizabeth, New Jersey

My dear Stewart:

I have been in such a whirl since returning from Scotland that I have not sent you even a line. I found on my return on the Acquitania nearly two weeks ago, that Dr. Brunner was not at all well. He was also overwhelmed with concern about the European situation as it affected Switzerland. It was quite evident, after taking everything into account, that he should go home at the earliest possible moment, and so he sailed last Saturday. He was happily able to bring his lectures to a close here in Princeton, even though he had to leave before the official end of the session. In any announcement that you may make in The Presbyterian, it might be said that for reasons of health and the serious character of the European situation that he returned earlier than he had originally intended.

You will also be interested to know that Dr. Brunner had definitely declined the invitation from the University. Neither institution, nor both together, could hold him in this country. We do not propose making any appointment to the Chair of Theology for next year. The year will be devoted to canvassing the field of possibilities in order that a wise appointment might be made. During next year the work in Theology will be divided between Dr. Piper and Dr. Bronkema, with Dr. Kuizenga as Chairman of the Department of Theology.

It may interest you to know that we have divided up all our courses into four main departments: the Department of Biblical Literature, the Department of History, the Department of Systematic Theology, and the Department of Practical Theology. In this way we hope to integrate and coardinate the work done in the Seminary much better than we have been able to do heretofore.

I saw Professor Maclean and conveyed to him your greetings. I also asked him to suggest to me any particularly good men that he knew of in Scotland for the Chair of Theology or any other Chair. But how ashamed I am to relate that somehow or other your letter which I was carefully holding to hand over to him mysteriously disappeared and for the life of me I cannot find it. It must have slipped out of the folder in which I was keeping it on shipboard on the way to Liverpool. This fact deeply chagrined me, as I had looked forward to handing your missive to Professor Maclean. We had a long talk together

and I informed him that I had been the bearer of a letter from you but that somehow or other it had disappeared.

I hope that you will be here at Commencement time, and that we will have an opportunity for a good talk, either then or sometime in the not distant future.

With affectionate regards,

Yours ever,

John

JAM:F John A. Mackay